

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated August 31, 2010, the Examiner (1) required restriction to one of Groups I (claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 14-18, 24-29, 32-39, 43, 46, and 49-55); II (claims 56-63); and III (claims 64-71) for prosecution on the merits; (2) acknowledged that Applicants made a provisional election without traverse to prosecute Group II (claims 56-63) during a telephone conversation with David Rose on August 26, 2010; (3) withdrew claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 14-18, 24-29, 32-39, 43, 46, 49-55 and 64-71 as being drawing to a non-elected invention; (4) rejected claims 61-63 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Garnham et al.* (U. S. Patent 5,992,527) or *Allen* (U.S. Patent 6,484,807); or *Hynes et al.* (U.S. Patent 4,478,287); and (5) rejected claims 56-60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donald et al.* (U. S. Patent 7,111,168) in view of *Fenton et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,460,621).

Election

Applicant affirms the election of Group II. Non-elected claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 14-18, 24-29, 32-39, 43, 46, 49-55, and 64-71 have been cancelled.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

With respect to the rejection of claim 61-63 under § 102(b), claim 61 has been amended to distinguish the cited prior art. Neither *Garnham et al.*, nor *Allen*, nor *Hynes et al.* teach a utility skid with a production fluid conduit for alignment with a vertical bore extending upwardly in a wing block mounted to the tree body. *Garnham et al.* does not teach an upwardly extending vertical bore in a wing block or a production fluid conduit for alignment with an upwardly extending vertical bore in a wing block. The Examiner points to member 29 as a vertical bore when in fact member 29 is a master valve 29 internal to the extension of lateral bore 24. *Allen* does not teach a tree body, a wing block, or an upwardly extending vertical bore in a wing block for alignment with a production fluid conduit on a utility skid. The Examiner points to Fig 3 as showing a vertical bore. However the only vertical conduit is a flow loop 114 that is connected to a riser extending to the surface for injecting drilling cuttings into the well. *Hynes et al.* does not teach a tree body, a wing block, or an upwardly extending vertical bore in a wing block for alignment with a production fluid conduit on a utility skid. The Examiner points to Fig 3A as showing a vertical bore. However side outlet 90' is connected to a valve 30 that is attached to a line 90 connected to drill pipe 32 that serves as a kill line for injecting fluids to kill the well. Further, it is not seen that the cited prior art teaches a skid guide engageable with a tree guide. *Garnham et al.* teaches a system for aligning a horizontal tree with a wellhead and not a skid

guide onto a tree guide. *Allen* teaches a system for aligning a BOP with a wellhead. *Hynes et al.* teaches a system for aligning a BOP and kill line 32 with a wellhead housing 20 and drilling spool 26.

Claims 62-63 are allowable for the reasons given for Claim 61. Further with respect to claim 62, as amended, and claim 63, the cited prior art does not teach a production fluid conduit engaging an upwardly extending vertical bore in a wing block. *Garnham et al* does not teach an upwardly extending vertical bore and neither *Allen*, nor *Hynes et al.* teach a wing block.

New claim 72 has been added to further claim the present invention in view of claim 61. No new matter has been added. Neither *Garnham et al.*, nor *Allen*, nor *Hynes et al.* teach a processing apparatus.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

With respect to the rejection of claims 56-60 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donald et al* in view of *Fenton et al.*, claims 56-60 are distinguishable over the cited prior art. In particular, with respect to claims 56 and 59, *Fenton et al.* does not teach a wing block having an upwardly facing vertical bore nor a conduit on the utility skid that is received by a wing block vertical bore. The utility skid 33 referenced by the Examiner includes the production tree 31 and therefore is not a separate utility skid landable on the tree. In effect the skid is installed with the tree. The production tree 31 lands on a wellhead assembly 11. If the Examiner is suggesting that the production module 61 shown in Fig 2 is the skid, then the production module 61 does not teach a conduit or stab that is received by an upwardly facing vertical bore in the wing block.

Claims 57 and 58 are allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 56. Further, with respect to claim 57, as amended, the choke body of *Fenton et al* is not attached to the tree wing block. With respect to claim 58, claim 58 is allowable in combination with claim 56. Claim 60 is allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 59. Further with respect to claim 60, *Fenton et al.* does not teach a vertical bore closer to the opposite end face than to the tree body.

Claim 73 has been added to further claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. The cited prior art does not teach the recited plug.

Voluntary Amendments

Applicants have made certain voluntary amendments to the claims. The amendments to claims 56-58 are voluntary amendments to delete “system” as being an unnecessary limitation. Dependent claim 57 has been voluntarily amended to clarify that the upwardly facing vertical bore is formed in the

choke body. Claims 59 and 61 have been voluntarily amended to use the gerunds “being” and “having.” Claim 61 has been voluntarily amended to substitute “upper end” for “tree cap” and to delete “means” to broaden the claim. Further claims 61 and 62 have been amended by adding “production” to better define the fluid conduit. The above identified amendments were voluntary and were not required for purposes of patentability. Thus Applicant is entitled to the application of the Doctrine of Equivalents under *Festo* with respect to the amended limitations.

CONCLUSION

During the course of these remarks, Applicant has at times referred to particular limitations of the claims that are not shown in the applied prior art. This shorthand approach to discussing the claims should not be construed to mean that the other claimed limitations are not part of the claimed invention. They are as required by law. Consequently, when interpreting the claims, each of the claims should be construed as a whole, and patentability determined in light of this required claim construction. Unless Applicant has specifically stated that an amendment was made to distinguish the prior art, it was the intent of the amendment to further clarify and better define the claimed invention and the amendment was not for the purpose of patentability. Further, although Applicant may have amended certain claims, Applicant has not abandoned its pursuit of obtaining the allowance of these claims as originally filed and reserves, without prejudice, the right to pursue these claims in a continuing application.

Should any fees have been inadvertently omitted, or if any additional fees are required, or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit to those fees to Deposit Account No. 03-0335 of Cameron International, Houston, Texas and consider this paper a petition for any necessary extension of time.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this communication, he is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite the resolution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

/David A. Rose/
DAVID A. ROSE
Reg. No. 26,223
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P. O. Box 3267
Houston, Texas 77253-3267
(713) 238-8000
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

CAMERON INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION
P. O. Box 1212
Houston, Texas 77251